

APR 25 2008

Serial No.: 10/627,889  
Attorney Docket No.: 200208326-1**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated January 25, 2008, claims 1, 10, 16, 19 and 22 have been amended. Claims 1-19 and 22-24 are in the case. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-19 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Sannoh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2003/0071908).

The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection based on the amendments to the claims and the arguments below. Specifically, the Examiner argued on page 3 of the January 25, 2008 Office Action that Sannoh et al. disclosed that the person is not visible on the display "when the person shown in FIG. 5B quickly moves out of the camera's field of view or the camera is accidentally directed to another view other than the current view shown in Figs. 5B & 6B."

However, although Sannoh et al. disclose facial detection of objects with face characteristic and face recognition methods (see Abstract and Summary of Sannoh et al.), the Applicant respectfully submits that FIGS. 5B & 6B show the tracked object, the face of a person, clearly staying within the field of view. In contrast, to the Examiner's statement, these figures do not show the face quickly moving out of the camera's field of view or the camera is accidentally directed to another view other than the current view.

On the other hand, the Applicant's claimed invention uses the distance and/or direction relationships to track the object in the first, second and third views that are screens-widths away from each other as the first view is panned to the second and third views, unlike Sannoh et al. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification and at least in FIGS. 2-3 and paragraph [0017] of the Applicant's specification (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0018066). Thus, Sannoh et al. instead unquestionably disclose face detection as the face continually stays within a field of view (as explicitly disclosed in paragraph [0104] and FIGS. 5A, 5B, 5C and 5D) and not as the views are panned, like the Applicant's claimed invention.

Consequently, since Sannoh et al. do not disclose all of the claimed elements of the independent claims, Sannoh et al. cannot anticipate the claims. Hence, the Applicant submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 should be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of the dependent claims, because they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, and they contain additional limitations

Serial No.: 10/627,889  
Attorney Docket No.: 200208326-1

that are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, these claims are also considered to be patentable (MPEP § 2143.03).

Thus, it is respectfully requested that all of the claims be allowed based on the amendments and arguments. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicant kindly requests the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at **(818) 885-1575**.

Please note that all mail correspondence should continue to be directed to:

Hewlett Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,  
Dated: April 25, 2008



Edmond A. DeFrank  
Reg. No. 37,814  
Attorney for Applicant  
(818) 885-1575 TEL  
(818) 885-5750 FAX